

This bill will authorize 40,000 active duty Coast Guard personnel who perform all kinds of services, including safety inspections of freighters, transporting sick or injured people to medical attention, measuring the catch of a commercial fishing boat, searching for sailors lost at sea, breaking ice in the northeastern rivers, and on and on and on.

The first Coast Guard district in my hometown of Boston oversees 30 cutters, 11 aircraft, and more than 200 small boats to ensure boaters' safety. Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues, these people earn their keep. Every day the Coast Guard saves an average of 12 lives. Each year they save about \$2.5 billion in property, which is nearly the entire operating budget.

Earlier this month, a Coast Guard cutter saved an 85-foot tug off the coast of Sakonnet Point in Rhode Island that was taking on water and absolutely would have sunk if the Coast Guard did not come on the scene.

Last month, Coast Guard personnel responded to a 200-gallon gasoline spill in New Haven Harbor; and before allowing the boat to load any new cargo, the Coast Guard ensured that that boat had been properly repaired before it went underway.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year a Coast Guard helicopter rescued from a New Bedford fishing vessel a fisherman whose arm was hanging off because it was injured in a severe accident by a winch and they flew this injured seaman to a Rhode Island hospital, where he recovered.

In January, the United States Coast Guard crew saved six people on a 72-foot sailing vessel in trouble seven miles south of Gloucester, Massachusetts. And every day the Coast Guard is out there protecting people on American waters. They do us a wonderful service, and this bill would keep them up and running.

I would like to commend the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for putting together a truly bipartisan bill which should pass the House with very little opposition.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will enable the Coast Guard to continue its great work, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I join my colleague from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in heaping praise on the Coast Guard for extraordinary work under extremely difficult conditions. Anybody who has been in New England in the winter knows just what he speaks of when he talks about being out there on the high seas.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

This is a great day for the Irish, a great day for the Coast Guard, a great day for the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), and maybe a great day for America's steel industry and steelworkers. I support the rule on the Coast Guard. But I also plan to speak out of turn on the rule that will follow since it is limited for time.

Ronald Reagan came to my district in 1980. He stood on a flatbed truck. Struggling steelworkers were pleading with the President for help. Ronald Reagan made a pledge. He said, "I will support the steel industry. I will make significant investments to help retool the steel industry." And he said, "I will also make significant investments to retrain steelworkers so they can deal with the new steel technologies."

Those steelworkers did not even support Ronald Reagan. Ronald Reagan lived up to every word. From the investment tax credit, to retraining money, Ronald Reagan lived up to his word.

In 1992, a candidate named Bill Clinton came through my district all through the steel Rust Belt and went down through Wierton, West Virginia. He said, "I will ban illegal trade to protect the steel industry." And he even said, "I will stop and I will ban scab labor."

In 1993, President Clinton had a Democrat House and a Democrat Senate. There was not one word about scab labor, regardless about how we feel on the issue. And in 1999, Bill Clinton has not done one thing about illegal trade.

Labor unions and working people supported this President by more than 95 percent. Today's legislation is not perfect. Not all of us are totally enamored with all parts of it. But until this moment, the President is saying he may not support it. I say, on the House floor, labor unions have been the suckers. How many more cock-and-bull stories are they going to hear?

Now, the only statement I will make is I want to support this bill. I support this rule even though it is a closed rule. And it is time for Congress to take one other stand. See, I do not believe we should be debating illegal trade. I do not believe we should be legislating illegal trade. I think illegal trade should be banned and we should have taken this opportunity to send a message to the world.

The only thing that bothers me about the bills since I have been in Congress is I keep hearing Members say, "it is the best we can do."

□ 1045

What I say is if the best we can do is not the best for America, then it is not the best we can do and we should not do it.

I am going to support this bill. I believe if this President vetoes this bill, his veto should be overridden, and if he vetoes this bill, I think the American worker better take a good look at a lot of promises that have been made over the years by this administration that have not been lived up to.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Lest Members might be a little confused, the gentleman who just spoke so passionately and eloquently about the steel matter and talking about a closed rule was not talking about the rule that we have on the floor now. This is a wide open rule, and I urge its strong support by all Members.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 975, REDUCING VOLUME OF STEEL IMPORTS AND ESTABLISHING STEEL IMPORT NOTIFICATION AND MONITORING PROGRAM

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 114 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 114

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 975) to provide for a reduction in the volume of steel imports, and to establish a steel import notification and monitoring program. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) ninety minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend from South Boston, MA (Mr. MOAKLEY) who obviously is on a roll here and is wearing a much greener tie than any of us, showing his great, great celebration of St. Patrick's Day. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time that I will be yielding will be for debate purposes only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 114 is a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 975, a bill to reduce the volume of steel imports and establishing a steel import notification and monitoring program. This rule was adopted unanimously by the Committee on Rules yesterday afternoon.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule further provides 90 minutes of debate in the House equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on

Ways and Means. It is the understanding, Mr. Speaker, of the Committee on Rules that both the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means intend to yield this debate time in a fair manner. This will ensure that Members on both sides of the aisle who are on different sides of this very important issue are provided the opportunity to have their voices heard.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America has the strongest, most prosperous economy on the face of the earth. There are many reasons for that. We have the world's most skilled workers. We have entrepreneurial investors and inventors in unmatched numbers. We have the largest single market anywhere. And, we are riding on that great wave of the information revolution.

Mr. Speaker, these are all keys to our prosperity and growth, but they are not enough. Right at the heart of our prosperity is the openness and dynamism of our economy. We accept the reality of change and adapt to it better than anyone else. Western Europe and Japan are big and rich with millions of skilled workers, but they suffer from slow growth and massive unemployment. Why? They are not as open and dynamic as we are. They fear inevitable change. And what happens? Their people lose because of that fear of change.

Now, there is no question that an open, dynamic economy offers as many challenges as it does opportunities. International commerce is increasingly a fact of life in our economy. It means new markets and it means very stiff, tough competition. But no question, no question about it at all, Mr. Speaker, we as a Nation are succeeding. U.S. jobs have increased by 6 million in the years since the North American Free Trade Agreement and the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade were passed. Trade now accounts for 30 percent of our gross domestic product and 25 percent of jobs in this country. We would not enjoy our job and wealth boom if we did not have open trade and competition.

Given our leading role in the global economy, turmoil such as the financial crisis that swept through many developing countries in the past 18 months has a major impact right here at home. Today, we are going to consider legislation that specially selects the U.S. steel industry for special protection to assist them in dealing with the challenges posed by that foreign financial situation. It is clear to me that a majority of Members of this House want to have this debate. It is my hope that as we delve into this issue, the House rejects this special interest legislation.

Mr. Speaker, let us take my State of California. Our State, I am very proud to say, is on the cutting edge of our Nation's 21st century economy. Almost

half of every dollar in the largest State of the union of economic activity is connected to trade, a 50 percent greater share than the Nation as a whole. The neighboring ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles combine to be the second largest seaport in the world, second only to Singapore. More than 15 percent of southern California's small businesses export products and services to other countries, many to Asia. This is five times the national rate.

Given our State's stake in exports to Asia and Latin America, California has been challenged more than most by this global economic turmoil. Shipments to Asia account for half of the State's merchandise exports. Asian problems represent a real threat to our State's economy. In California, millions of working families depend on producing computers, electronic components, industrial machinery, communications equipment, aircraft, semiconductors, textiles, apparel, automobiles, glassware, engineering and management services, and a whole range of agriculture interests that have been challenged by the impact of currency devaluations and financial turmoil. They are fighting to meet the challenge by becoming more efficient and diversifying their markets.

The steel industry should do the same. The fact is 40 times more American workers are employed in U.S. industries that use steel than in the industries that actually make steel. When we use protectionism to shield one industry, 40 times more Americans are injured. Remarkably, today, U.S. steel production and demand are at record levels. Let me underscore that again. U.S. steel production and demand are at record levels. Revenue per ton of steel was stable in 1998, not declining. Yes, there were fewer steel jobs at the end of 1998 than at the beginning, but that is a reality of the industry as it modernizes. Since 1993, jobs have fallen by 9,000 per year while production of steel has actually increased.

Mr. Speaker, protectionism is not the answer to the pain caused by economic turmoil overseas. Special interest protectionism will kill the goose that laid the golden egg that is our growing economy. The sponsors of H.R. 975 are asking us to start down a well-worn path to economic despair. Protectionism is fool's gold.

Mr. Speaker, I advocate passage of this rule. We need to engage in a very serious debate to talk about this issue, and then I hope that this House will reject this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very dear friend from California who has agreed to wear a green tie for sake of harmony today for yielding me the customary half-hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the United States economy is booming. Economic growth is strong, job creation is at an all-time high, but not every American is shar-

ing in the good times. At the same time the stock market is flirting with the 10,000 mark, 10,000 American steelworkers lost their jobs last year, 10,000 hardworking American families lost their paychecks, and 10,000 steel families face a very uncertain future.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one reason for this. It is the flood of cheap foreign steel being dumped into our markets in violation of the international trade laws, and it is drowning our steel industry.

Mr. Speaker, back in the 1970s, the American steel industry faced another crisis, a crisis of competitiveness. The American steel industry invested \$50 billion to modernize plants and equipment. They also downsized, giving up about 200,000 good jobs. They innovated. American steelworkers made themselves more efficient. American steelworkers made themselves more productive. As a consequence, Mr. Speaker, America now produces the highest quality steel at the lowest cost per ton. Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker. American steelworkers produce the highest quality, lowest cost steel in the entire world. But even the most productive workers cannot compete with countries that do not play by the rules. The surge of unfair dumping of cheap foreign steel imports is costing America jobs and costing America money, and it is time that we take some very tough action.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has recently taken steps in the right direction. The administration found that Russia, Japan and Brazil had been dumping steel and issued rulings against these countries. The President has virtually stopped imports of hot-rolled steel from Russia and Japan, imports from Brazil are down by 76 percent, but at the same time cheap imports from China, South Africa and Indonesia have skyrocketed.

Mr. Speaker, even though the administration has taken some very good steps, there is much more to be done. This bill directs the President to take the steps to roll back the level of imported steel to the pre-July 1997 crisis levels. This bill leaves it to the President whether these steps involve quotas or tariff surcharges or restraint agreements or any other measures.

This bill also establishes a steel import monitoring program to make sure other countries comply with anti-dumping laws and provides information to help industry, labor and government respond to surges in imports.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) and the other sponsors of this bill for their efforts. And I want to thank my dear friend from California who has granted this rule despite his objections to the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for action. American steel is much too important and American steelworkers deserve better. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from St. Clairsville, OH (Mr. NEY).

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for the fact that we have this on the floor today. Although we would differ in opinion, the process is going to work by having us here.

Mr. Speaker, as a coauthor of the Visclosky-Regula steel legislation, I am committed to standing up for steel. This legislation brings back the integrity of our antidumping provisions of the Trade and Tariff Act of 1930.

But this bill is not about free trade versus fair trade versus protectionism. It is about illegal dumping. And that is a big difference. This bill is pro-worker and it is pro-American.

Eleven thousand steelworkers, as we noted before, have lost their jobs. Eleven thousand steelworkers are trying to decide today, and one more per hour, how they feed their families, how they help their communities, how they survive.

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because the President had lack of courage. In a combined effort with my colleagues we introduced legislation to freeze steel imports at pre-July 1997 levels. This legislation would do what President Clinton has not done, and that is to stand up for steelworkers and put America's interests first for a change. In October we had 344 Members on a bipartisan basis in October that urged the end of this. Yes, the administration is now starting to do some things 11,000 steelworkers later, and I cannot trust that if we do not push through this legislation and pass it, that it will not go back to the way it was.

So, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is absolutely critical.

There is a solution; it is a simple one. We must enforce our trade laws. That is it. The U.S. steel industry is not asking for special protection, and, quite frankly, they do not need it. Our working men and women can compete with anyone on this planet. They can and will compete against any steel in the world. But we cannot go against illegally-dumped steel.

But let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, and tell my colleagues why we are here today, how we got to this point.

We are here today because we are going to stand up for Main Street today, not Wall Street. That is why this bill is here. It is here because of leaders like Mark Glyptis, and George Becker, and Chip Antonacci, and Larry Mallas and John Sanders and Dave Gossett stood up and spoke out, and we are here because thousands of steelworkers and citizens would not let this issue go, would not let this issue die. Thousands rallied back home in a multi-state area, and they came here

to the streets of Washington, D.C., 7,000 strong. They brought their children. People came here from all walks of life, Republican, Democrat, Independent, the wealthy, the poor, the unemployed, the workers, the students. Students made phone calls. People protested. They stood up for their rights.

That is why we are here today, Mr. Speaker, because people spoke out. The steelworkers, and the citizens, and the students and the people of our communities have said to their government: Stand up for us for a change.

It is very simple in my mind. We are today going to support Japan or we are going to support Weirton, West Virginia. We today are going to support Brazil or we are going to support Steubenville, Ohio. This is a bill about the fact that America today speaks out. The people speak out on the floor, the people win and America wins.

Support the rule and the bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 975.

Mr. Speaker, we are here because of policies which have failed to protect the American steel industry and workers from unfair competition. The administration could have prevented this bill from coming to the floor by initiating its own restrictions on the surge of cheap imported steel, but the administration would not go to such lengths to protect the steel industry. But they have gone the distance and more to protect the banana industry.

Mr. Speaker, does the banana industry employ 160,000 American workers? No. Are foreign bananas crowding out the American banana business? No. This has not stopped the administration from making every effort to protect the banana industry.

Bananas did not build America. Steel did. Steel helped build our automotive industry. Steel helped build our defense. We cannot build a tank with a banana, we cannot build a plane with a banana, we cannot build ships with a banana. We did not build cars with bananas. We did not build bridges with bananas. We did not build America with bananas. We built America with steel. But the administration has ignored the steel industry that employs 160,000 Americans that have suffered the loss of 10,000 jobs since the import crisis began and that has endured the undercutting of its American market. The administration cares more about bananas than about steel. Such a trade policy is, in a word, bananas.

Our approach is different from the administration's. H.R. 975 is the only action that will directly confront the major cause of layoffs in the steel industry. Our bill is America's best hope of averting an economic crisis of our own.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule, and I urge support for H.R. 975.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Madison Village, Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for not only giving me the time, but also for bringing this rule to the floor, and, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of both the rule and also the bill today before us. I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and everyone else who had a hand in bringing this bill before us today.

I do want to express some concerns about the manner in which H.R. 975 addresses the steel dumping issue. There is no doubt many speakers will talk about the fact that 10,000 steelworkers have lost their jobs as a result of steel dumping, but for every one steelworker in this country there are 40 downstream employees in the metal forming and metal stamping business, and I want to chat about them for just a minute in this 3 minutes.

The U.S. steel industry, even when it is going full guns, is never able to meet all of our steel demands in this country. At current levels the estimates are maybe 75 percent, which leaves us with a shortage of 17 to 24 million tons each and every year. There are some contracts and applications that call for nondumped, but foreign, steel. There is a metal foreman in my district that has a contract that calls for Dutch steel, for instance, and he says that if we put in restrictive quotas in certain situations, well then that company will just have the goods stamped over in the Netherlands, and we will have imported into this country a finished product. If steel is unavailable or a specific kind of steel is unavailable for a given application, our downstream manufacturers will lose contracts, and imports will come into this country on a finished basis.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage in a brief colloquy with the chief sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), and I would ask the gentleman:

Given the concerns of a short supply, why is it that he looked at in H.R. 975 the quotas, tariffs and other remedies to control the amount of steel coming into this country rather than focusing on dumping margins which are contained in Section 201 of the 1974 trade act?

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATOURETTE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's concern.

The reason we looked at a quantitative and global approach is because, if we look at a product, if we look at a specific country based on a price, we are not going to resolve the crisis.

I would point out, for example, on a country basis steel exports from India suddenly increased to 70 percent in

January of 1990 compared to just December of 1998. Exports from Australia increased 31 percent in that last month. Exports from Korea increased by 25 percent.

So we are going to have to look at shifting within countries of various product lines as well as in people following behind if we do achieve success with one country coming in with new quantities of steel and again would remind the gentleman we are giving the administration 60 days to fashion their initiative, and they have great flexibility as to the design of that final plan.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his answer, and I also thank the gentleman very much for his courage in bringing this bill forward.

I would ask as a further courtesy, as this bill proceeds, if we discover that the quotas in place by H.R. 975 have an adverse effect and cause a short supply for our end users in this country, that we be willing across the aisle to work and address that issue, and I am certain that we can do that.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Absolutely.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman from Indiana very much.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

(Mr. LIPINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for the time, and I rise in support of this rule and also in support of this resolution. In the last 12 months 10,000 American steelworkers have found out firsthand that fair trade is not fair and free trade is not free. The cost of those 10,000 American workers was more than their jobs. It was the loss of a lifestyle, a loss of the retirement savings, a loss of a promising future, and for some the cost was a loss of their home and even their family.

Mr. Speaker, it has not stopped yet. Thousands of more jobs will be lost if we do not act now. Ten thousand, and still counting, steelworkers have lost their jobs, not because of fair competition, but because of unfair competition. Employers and employees worked and sacrificed together to modernize the American steel industry, making it once again the most efficient steel industry in the world. They are willing to compete fairly, but they do not have a chance unless their government once again makes the playing field level. Foreign countries facing recessions and owing interest on American loans have targeted America as a place to raise hard cash. Countries where it takes \$400 to make a ton of steel are dumping it here in record amounts for \$200 a ton. Stopping that is not protectionism. It is ending an illegal business practice, one we would not allow one American company to do to another.

Mr. Speaker, if this administration will not show the same compassion for

American workers as they do for the economies of Japan, Korea and Russia, they would stop this dumping now. They already have that power. I am troubled that we need to legislate an end to the dumping because legislation takes time, and time is something the American steel industry and its workers are running out of. The world tried this once before, and the greatest free trader of all, Ronald Reagan, put a stop to it. Now they are trying it again, and because this administration is more concerned about the world's economy, it is letting them do it.

Mr. Speaker, this administration will not stop this, so it is up to us. Let us act quickly.

This Administration cannot continue to hide behind "overall" rosy economic statistics while dismissing certain sectors of the economy as having troubles. Not when it already has the power to help those certain sectors—like the steel industry.

Yes, people are being hired in record numbers. But, for what kind of jobs? Too often, people are being hired at a Wal-Mart so then they have the money to eat at McDonald's—who in turn hire people to serve those Wal-Mart employees—allowing these new McDonald workers to take their salary and spend it at Wal-Mart—who can then hire more low wage employees.

We should not even talk about the low wage jobs being created at Wal-Mart and McDonalds, but we should speak loudly and forcefully about the good high paying, benefit rich jobs these people had before they were laid off.

A 20-dollar an hour job with benefits at a steel mill cannot be replaced by a 6-dollar job at Wal-Mart. But that's what's happening.

And don't tell me about the average income of an American worker, when included in that average is a 100 million dollar severance pay to a Hollywood insider, a 20 million dollar bonus for a corporate executive who's rewarded for chopping down his workforce, and a 70 million dollar contract to a professional athlete.

Ten thousand, and still counting, steel workers have lost their jobs, not because of fair competition but because of unfair competition.

Employers and employees worked and sacrificed together to modernize the American steel industry—making it once again the most efficient steel industry in the world.

They are willing to compete fairly but they do not have a chance unless their Government once again makes the playing field level.

Foreign countries facing recessions and owing interest on American loans have targeted America as a place to raise hard cash.

Countries where it takes 400 dollars to make a ton of steel are dumping it here in record amounts for 200 dollars a ton.

Stopping that isn't protectionism—it's ending an illegal business practice—one we wouldn't allow one American company to do to another.

If this Administration would show the same compassion for American steelworkers as they do for the economies of Japan, Korea, and Russia, they would stop this dumping now.

They already have the power.

I'm troubled that we need to legislate an end to this dumping because legislation takes time, and time is something the American steel industry and its workers are running out of.

The world tried this once before, and the greatest free trader of all—Ronald Reagan—took his eyes off the balance sheets and focused them on the American families and he said that's wrong and put a stop to it.

Now, they're trying it again and because this Administration is more concerned about the world's economy, it's letting them do it.

But what if that's not enough? If they're willing to let the steel industry be undercut by foreign competitors acting illegally, what other industries will they allow the same thing to be done to?

The Administration won't stop this—so it is up to us.

Let's do it quickly.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mapleton, Utah (Mr. CANNON).

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of our steel industry. The administration, Mr. Speaker, is compromising our national security by failing to enforce our trade laws. Our steel industry is critical to our national security. American steel companies across the Nation are going bust. Yet without American steel companies to supply our Armed Forces, our national defense is useless.

Let me cite some statistics. In the Gulf War the U.S. Army relied on the steel in 5,000 tanks, Bradleys and other armored personnel carriers. At the peak of the conflict in the Persian Gulf, the U.S. Navy deployed 120 ships made almost exclusively of American steel. Because the administration has failed to do its job in implementing import controls, Congress has to step in today to legislate trade policy and safeguard our defense.

A vote in support of this legislation today is a vote to uphold our national security and stop illegal foreign dumping. This will allow our steel industry to rebuild and our workers to go back to work and save our families. I urge a yes vote.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying Visclosky legislation, H.R. 975. It is necessary for this Congress to act to bring fairness to the steel industry, fairness in our trade policies.

I support open trade markets, but only fair trade, not free trade.

In the 1980's the steel industry came under heavy assault by countries dumping their steel here in the United States. The United States did nothing. We almost lost our steel industry. In my district, we mine iron ore, and we make iron ore pellets. To make the steel, Mr. Speaker, we need the iron ore pellets. Without our iron mines, there is no steel industry in the United States.

In the 1980's, prior to the illegal dumping, there were over 4500 miners in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

Today our mines employ less than 2,200 miners. We cannot absorb any more losses.

That is why Sunday I joined approximately 2,000 of my friends in Negaunee, Michigan, to stand up for steel. I want to see this and other anti-steel dumping legislation come to the floor of this House for a vote.

Now I have heard some Members say that they are reluctant to vote for this bill because they do not want to be perceived as anti-free trade. The question is not about free trade, it is about fair trade.

I say it is time to stand up for fair trade. Join us and stand up for our miners and steelworkers so they can rebuild the financial security they are fighting hard to achieve. Stand up for the steel companies who have worked to be the best steel producers in the world. Stand up for the workers and industries across a broad segment of our economy who need to see us get tough with foreign countries who have betrayed our good-faith efforts to promote open and fair trade.

□ 1115

It is time to stand up for our constituents, stand up for our communities, stand up for the Iron Range, stand up for steel and stand up for America. Vote yes on H.R. 975.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 16 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 20½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the closed rule and in support of the legislation before us. Once again, we are here pleading for some action by the Congress and the administration to step in and take care of a problem that has been hurting the hard-working steelworkers of the First Congressional District of Arkansas and across this country for far too long.

We are here today because the legislation we are debating will directly address the surge of unfairly traded imports. We must pass this legislation, and the administration must support it.

I cannot even count how many times we have stood here asking for the same thing, enforce our trade laws, stop illegal foreign dumping of steel in the United States. The administration has stood by for months now with their hands in their pockets doing nothing for the thousands of steelworkers in the First Congressional District of Arkansas and across this country who have lost their jobs, people who have families to feed.

We have been promised action time and time again but have seen nothing. I urge support of this legislation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON).

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule on the bipartisan Steel Recovery Act. Over the last several months, we have waged a battle on the issue of illegal dumping of foreign steel on American markets. I firmly believe that no American steelworker should have to sacrifice their job or their livelihood because of a foreign importer that breaks American trade laws. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand firm in support of U.S. steel, U.S. steelworkers and their families as the steel industry confronts an onslaught of unfairly traded steel imports.

Collapse of demand in Asia, Russia and Brazil have resulted in historic global overcapacity. Foreign producers choking on a global steel oversupply are desperate to sell steel and are willing to dump it at whatever price possible, to whatever market is open to them; in other words, the United States. Last year alone, imports from Japan, Korea and Russia soared by nearly 170 percent, 137 percent and 70 percent respectively.

Mr. Speaker, I urge full support of the rule and for the bill.

As a result, the U.S. steel industry is in a fight for its life. Steelworkers in Utah, Pennsylvania, and Alabama have been the hardest hit with each State losing several thousand workers. In Indiana, the Nation's largest steel producer, providing 23 percent of the raw steel made in the United States, up to 3,000 of its 30,000 steel workers—10 percent—have had to accept shortened work weeks, lower-paying job assignments, or early retirement. The Department of Commerce recently reported that 11,000 steel workers have already been laid off. That's 11,000 x's the American families who now face uncertain futures because we did not take action when we could have.

We must take all measures necessary to halt the flood of unfairly traded steel into the United States. Congress and the Administration must work together to enact stronger trade laws to prevent surges of dumped and subsidized foreign steel from devastating our workers and companies again. And, most immediately, Congress must act to slow these imports now before our steel industry is too seriously injured to recover.

America's hard-working families are looking to us to be their voice. Mr. Speaker, I intend to stand up for them and vote for H.R. 975. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and in favor of the bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, support for the Steel Recovery Act is not protectionism; it is a vote for fair trade in steel, fair

trade in the U.S. and international marketplace. 1999, for the steel industry in America is what Yogi Berra once called *deja vu* all over again. We are seeing 1980 being repeated in 1999.

In 1980, we had produced 120 million tons of steel, the highest steel production in the history of this country. Imports devastated the steel industry down to 80 million tons; 350,000 steelworkers lost their jobs. 10,000 people in my district, 10,000 workers in the iron ore mines of Minnesota, lost their jobs permanently. We went from a \$450 million payroll down to less than \$100 million in 18 months. We are not going to stand for that again.

Look at what is happening just this year in the iron ore mining company: Eveleth Tachonite Company forced to have layoffs because foreign steel is taking away the market in the domestic United States, subsidized foreign steel.

We have spent \$50 billion in the steel industry in this country modernizing America's steel mills. We have the highest productivity, the highest quality steel, the lowest cost per man unit of steel produced in America in the whole world, and yet Russia, Brazil, Japan, Korea, other countries, are dumping steel in this country at \$250 a ton less than we produce it right here at home. They are subsidizing and exporting their unemployment, dumping it on our shores. When it hits at home and when it hits your friends and your neighbors, then you have got to stand up for fairness in steel.

We have invested over \$2 billion in modernizing the iron ore mining and processing plants on the Mesabi iron range of northern Minnesota, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) said about his State. We should not stand for having that investment, that modernization of our industry wiped out by having foreign countries dump their unemployment on our shores, wiping out our American jobs.

Steel is the most important building material in an industrial society. We cannot engage a war, we cannot build our highways, we cannot construct our airports without steel. We are not going to have American bridges, American ports, American airports built with foreign steel subsidized to take away jobs from American workers when we have made the investments to modernize with private venture capital this greatest steel industry in the whole world and this finest iron ore mining industry in this whole world. Vote for the Steel Recovery Act.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE).

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I express my appreciation to the members of the Committee on Rules, the Committee on Ways and Means, to the leadership and to the Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), for their fair treatment on this issue. I know that the substance of the Visclosky steel bill may be of concern to some of these

Members so I am gratified to see this bill brought to the floor for consideration.

The subject of foreign steel dumping in the American market is simply too important, with an impact on too many areas of this country, for it not to receive consideration by the full membership of this House. This is the kind of bipartisan cooperation we need to see to solve the problems affecting American families, and I was especially gratified that the members of the Committee on Rules accepted our request for more debate time on this bill, as well as a closed rule.

On the substance of the bill, let me just say at this point that the Commerce Department has already issued its determination that illegal dumping and foreign government subsidies have occurred in Japan, Brazil and Russia. This constitutes the best, most informed judgment so far by the U.S. Government that illegal dumping is, in fact, occurring. We are playing by the rules but we are losing jobs to those who are not. Support fair trade. Vote for the rule and vote for final passage of H.R. 975.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and underlying legislation H.R. 975 which has been brought to us by our diligent colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA). I wanted to thank our good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) also for helping move this through the Committee on Rules. It is time to put steel back into the spine of America. 10,000 American steelworkers losing their jobs is beyond belief. The administration's delay to enforce dumping laws in this country, unforgivable. Since 1997, a glut of dumped imports on our shores, Indonesia up 612 percent, Japan 157 percent, Australia 156 percent, South Africa, 107 percent and Korea 105 percent; most of those countries are not covered by the administration's agreement.

If we in this Congress cannot stand up for our own when they are being unfairly dumped on, it is fair to ask, when do we stand up for anyone? Support the rule. Support H.R. 975.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me this time. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) join me in a brief colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, I want Members to know that this is a good bill and I support the bill but I do have some concerns about its impact on the steel producer in my district who has told me

about problems in obtaining the types and quantity of steel that they need from domestic producers. In the past, the government has been able to make very specific case-by-case exceptions to the import restrictions to allow manufacturers with legitimate short supply problems to continue producing their products and employing their workforce at full strength.

I believe there are conditions which may warrant further examination along these lines in the bill before us today and I would appreciate the assistance of the gentleman in working to rectify these problems.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) for his response.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate, first of all, the support of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) for the legislation, as well as his expression of concern.

The issue of short supply is an issue that we have considered from the inception of the original legislation and do believe that it is covered under the bill itself. The fact is, the administration, following enactment of H.R. 975, will have 60 days in which to fashion a comprehensive program that will still allow one out of every four tons of steel sold in the United States to be exported from another country.

Additionally, the reason we wanted to give the administration that flexibility and to put all of the countries and all of the products on one table is to make sure that companies such as the gentleman's in the State of Washington, earlier we had a gentleman on the other side, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), indicate he had a problem as far as possible short supply, that those can be addressed.

The reason we have looked at quantitative restrictions is, again, to make sure that we do not have people who are trading illegally under our trade laws following in behind someone else who is now obeying the law. That would be the responsibility of the administration, and I do appreciate very much the concerns the gentleman raised.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the consideration of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) on that. I appreciate, again, his hard work on this bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), who is the perfecter of the amendment that will be heard on the floor.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for the recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I would want to use this time not only to express my support for the rule but to make a number of thank you's in all sincerity. I think the coming together of Members in this case in a very bipartisan fashion, to work together selflessly over a period of nearly 8 months, to engender the

support again in a bipartisan fashion of this House, can lead the way to the legislative calendar for the next 2 years and simply want to again thank the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) particularly for their consideration. I know they have reservations about this legislation.

I want to make sure that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) is thanked and particularly the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader, for their inestimable help in this matter, and finally the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) who I again know have very serious reservations about the legislation, as well as the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

I would finally want to thank the steelworkers everywhere who have worked diligently throughout this crisis to make sure that the voice of workers in this country is heard, and those who have participated in the steel working group.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader of the House.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 975, a bill which is designed to reduce the flood of steel imports coming into the United States, and I would like to commend the work of especially the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Visclosky) for all the hard work that he has done in bringing this measure to the floor today.

□ 1130

Today, the House has the opportunity to send a strong message of support for American steel company workers and steel communities across this country.

Mr. Speaker, more than 10,000 high-wage and high-skill Americans in the steel industry have lost their jobs since the onslaught of foreign imported steel began about 2 years ago. H.R. 975 will grant real tangible relief for this industry that is vital to our industrial base and indeed, our national security. It will also aid the efforts of steel workers and companies to bring about stronger action to help the United States steel industry.

Mr. Speaker, an economic collapse has swept the globe, first striking in Asia, but now impacting Latin America and other developing countries as well. During the debate over IMF emergency funding to stabilize these economies, I warned that import surges would result from the Asian economic crisis and that a plan would be needed to combat the unfair imports. Unfortunately, no such plan has been forthcoming.

Between 1997 and 1998, steel imports have risen nearly 100 percent from key countries like Japan and Korea. Thus far, 10,000 jobs have been lost, but thousands more jobs are threatened as an

oversupply of foreign-made steel sits on our docks. Our steel industry is the most productive industry in the world. The U.S. should not be forced to unilaterally take in a massive global import surge.

While the Clinton administration has taken some much-needed steps by expediting relief to the steel industry via traditional U.S. trade laws, I am concerned that the administration has not done enough to promote a global solution to this problem. I believe this bill can help us find that solution.

The bill we are debating today simply limits imports to pre-crisis levels. It promotes a fair and level trading system for the United States steel industry by putting an end to the practice of foreign producers flooding our market with cheap steel that puts our industry and its workers in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to continuing our ongoing efforts with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the Steel Caucus, the Clinton administration, and all interested parties to develop a strong and realistic global solution to this crisis. Today's floor debate reminds us of the magnitude of the crisis in the steel country, and the passage of this bill will hopefully bring about the action which is needed to help reverse this economic calamity for thousands of workers and their families.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend my friend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) for all of his outstanding work that he has done on behalf of this particular bill and on behalf of the steel industry.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 975, the bipartisan Steel Recovery Act. This much-needed legislation will protect the U.S. Steel industry from unfair dumping of foreign steel into the United States market.

Since 1997, I and other Americans have watched Asian, Russian and Latin American countries dump their steel into this Nation. From 1997 to the present, U.S. Steel imports rose to 66 million tons, and it started out at 20 million tons. Over the past year, East Asia, Russia, and Brazil have illegally imported steel into this country at very low prices. Due in principal part to a lingering financial crisis which has devalued their currencies, these countries, East Asia, Russia, Brazil and others, have been getting away with murder.

Today, these unfair acts must come to an end because our Nation's citizens are the losers. In the State of Illinois, Acme Metals has filed for Chapter XI bankruptcy because it could not compete with the surge in steel imports. In my district, many steel companies have slowed down production. Some companies have even laid off workers or shortened their hours. We cannot sit idly by, Mr. Speaker, and let these countries destroy our steel mills. I support H.R. 975.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE).

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, this chart I think tells the story well. It begins in 1996 and finishes in January of 1999, and it is steel imports. Look at this line and how it suddenly shoots up.

Well, let me tell my colleagues what that line right there means, Mr. Speaker. That line does not tell us about the almost 1,000 Weirton Steel workers that are laid off, and they did exactly what our country asked them to do. They downsized, they invested, they became an ESOP, they played fair and they asked for a level playing field, and now there are 1,000 of them laid off because this government has not kept by its bargain and fought illegal imports.

It is not just Weirton, it is Wheeling Pit, it will be workers in Shinnston and Follansbee, and later it will be in Ravenswood at Century Aluminum and on down the Ohio River.

So, Mr. Speaker, this Congress must act today. It must send a clear, resolute message to this administration and to the world: We will not tolerate this line going any higher. We want those workers back to work, and the Congress will begin that process today.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the debate has begun, and we have had Members on both sides of the aisle who wanted us to proceed with consideration of this legislation, and so we have done that. We start during this rule, and I am happy to say that in the rule we extended, as I said, by 50 percent the amount of time that would normally be called for, an hour of general debate, we have extended that to an hour and a half, and I think that this discussion will continue. So I am going to urge strong support of the rule.

As those who have been following this debate know, Mr. Speaker, most of the discussion has been over the measure itself, and I have to say that seeing the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, come on to the House floor, it is nice to have him here, because it buoys me up in my very strong opposition to this ill-conceived measure.

In fact, today the U.S. steel industry benefits from very vigorous U.S. enforcement of our trade remedies. One-third of the 300 antidumping and countervailing duty orders administered by the Commerce Department address steel products. In addition, we have seen a great reduction in the last 4 months of imports from those countries in question: Japan, Russia, and Brazil. We also have to recognize that overall we have seen this reduction in steel imports, and that decline is one which seems to be continuing, and the numbers are phenomenal. If we go from November of 1998 to January of 1999, they have dropped by 93 percent from

Russia, 49 percent from Japan, 30 percent from Brazil, and 8 percent from Korea.

Mr. Speaker, we also have to recognize that 1998 was a banner year for the U.S. steel industry. In fact, 102 million tons of U.S. steel were shipped. Guess what the demand was? It was for 141 million tons. There is a demand out there that is greater than what is actually being produced, and yet, in 1998, this country produced the second highest amount of steel that we have ever produced in our Nation's history.

Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that this country today is economically strong because of our openness and our dynamism. We should not let fear create the kinds of problems that it has throughout the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, we look at the fact that there are many skilled workers in Western Europe, and yet their economies are faced with very, very great difficulties. Why? Because of the fear, because of the protectionism that they have imposed, and they do not have the kind of openness and dynamism that we have as a Nation.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at all of those downstream workers, 40 times as many as there are in the actual steel manufacturing industry in this country. The auto manufacturers, they also are in large part, as the Wall Street Journal pointed out in an editorial yesterday, responsible for this. The 54-day strike that took place with General Motors obviously decreased that opportunity for production during last fall's strike. So it seems to me that we need to recognize that consumers would be devastated by going down this slippery slope.

We have other industries, the oil and gas industry. As I said, in our State of California, our economy, because of the cuts in defense and aerospace over the past several years, hinges on our involvement in the international economy. Our State is the gateway to the Pacific Rim and Latin America. If we were to pass, move ahead with this legislation, it could be potentially devastating to the largest State in the Union, and I believe to this entire country.

So let us stand with our Nation's openness, diversity and dynamism, which has, in fact, given us the strongest economic growth that we have seen in many, many years.

With that, I urge support of the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman at the microphone, for his fairness in the presentation of this rule. He did extend the time, and he did allow the bill to come to the floor, even though he personally is opposed to it.

I also thank the gentleman for the timing, because as he knows, in 15 minutes the President of the United States



is going to join all Irishmen, Congressmen of Irish descent in the Rayburn Room for a March 17th dinner. So I thank the gentleman for that too, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 96-388, as amended by Public Law 97-84 (36 U.S.C. 1402(a)), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council:

Mr. GILMAN of New York;

Mr. LATOURETTE of Ohio; and

Mr. CANNON of Utah.

There was no objection.

#### REDUCING VOLUME OF STEEL IMPORTS AND ESTABLISHING STEEL IMPORT NOTIFICATION AND MONITORING PROGRAM

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 114, I call up the bill (H.R. 975) to provide for a reduction in the volume of steel imports, and to establish a steel import notification and monitoring program, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 975 is as follows:

H.R. 975

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. REDUCTION IN VOLUME OF STEEL IMPORTS.

(a) REDUCTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall take the necessary steps, by imposing quotas, tariff surcharges, negotiated enforceable voluntary export restraint agreements, or otherwise, to ensure that the volume of steel products imported into the United States during any month does not exceed the average volume of steel products that was imported monthly into the United States during the 36-month period preceding July 1997.

(b) ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—Within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this

Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, through the United States Customs Service, and the Secretary of Commerce shall implement a program for administering and enforcing the restraints on imports under subsection (a). The Customs Service is authorized to refuse entry into the customs territory of the United States of any steel products that exceed the allowable levels of imports of such products.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) CATEGORIES.—This section shall apply to the following categories of steel products: semifinished, plates, sheets and strips, wire rods, wire and wire products, rail type products, bars, structural shapes and units, pipes and tubes, iron ore, and coke products.

(2) VOLUME.—Volume of steel products for purposes of this section shall be determined on the basis of tonnage of such products.

(d) EXPIRATION.—This section shall expire at the end of the 3-year period beginning 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 2. STEEL IMPORT NOTIFICATION AND MONITORING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall establish and implement a steel import notification and monitoring program. The program shall include a requirement that any person importing a product classified under chapter 72 or 73 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States obtain an import notification certificate before such products are entered into the United States.

(b) STEEL IMPORT NOTIFICATION CERTIFICATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to obtain a steel import notification certificate, an importer shall submit to the Secretary of Commerce an application containing—

(A) the importer's name and address;

(B) the name and address of the supplier of the goods to be imported;

(C) the name and address of the producer of the goods to be imported;

(D) the country of origin of the goods;

(E) the country from which the goods are to be imported;

(F) the United States Customs port of entry where the goods will be entered;

(G) the expected date of entry of the goods into the United States;

(H) a description of the goods, including the classification of such goods under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States;

(I) the quantity (in kilograms and net tons) of the goods to be imported;

(J) the cost insurance freight (CIF) and free alongside ship (FAS) values of the goods to be entered;

(K) whether the goods are being entered for consumption or for entry into a bonded warehouse or foreign trade zone;

(L) a certification that the information furnished in the certificate application is correct; and

(M) any other information the Secretary of Commerce determines to be necessary and appropriate.

(2) ENTRY INTO CUSTOMS TERRITORY.—In the case of merchandise classified under chapter 72 or 73 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States that is initially entered into a bonded warehouse or foreign trade zone, a steel import notification certificate shall be required before the merchandise is entered into the customs territory of the United States.

(3) ISSUANCE OF STEEL IMPORT NOTIFICATION CERTIFICATE.—The Secretary of Commerce shall issue a steel import notification certificate to any person who files an application that meets the requirements of this section.

Such certificate shall be valid for a period of 30 days from the date of issuance.

(c) STATISTICAL INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall compile and publish on a weekly basis information described in paragraph (2).

(2) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—Information described in this paragraph means information obtained from steel import notification certificate applications concerning steel imported into the United States and includes with respect to such imports the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States classification (to the tenth digit), the country of origin, the port of entry, quantity, value of steel imported, and whether the imports are entered for consumption or are entered into a bonded warehouse or foreign trade zone. Such information shall also be compiled in aggregate form and made publicly available by the Secretary of Commerce on a weekly basis by public posting through an Internet website. The information provided under this section shall be in addition to any information otherwise required by law.

(d) FEES.—The Secretary of Commerce may prescribe reasonable fees and charges to defray the costs of carrying out the provisions of this section, including a fee for issuing a certificate under this section.

(e) SINGLE PRODUCER AND EXPORTER COUNTRIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Commerce shall make publicly available all information required to be released pursuant to subsection (c), including information obtained regarding imports from a foreign producer or exporter that is the only producer or exporter of goods subject to this section from a foreign country.

(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Commerce may prescribe such rules and regulations relating to the steel import notification and monitoring program as may be necessary to carry the provisions of this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 114, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 975.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. ARCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 975 directs the President, in effect mandates the President, to establish quotas to limit steel imports into the U.S., and I urge its defeat. This is more than rhetoric, this is a serious matter, and what we do today will have considerable impact not only on our own economy and our leadership in the world, but on the rest of the world.

□ 1145

A Wall Street Journal editorial yesterday called the bill, and I quote, "the